

REMARKS

The Examiner noted that the trademark PALM™ was used in the specification of the application and that the trademark should be capitalized and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Applicant has revised the first full paragraph on page 10 of the specification so that “PALM” is capitalized and generic terminology (a wireless network) is included. Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out this informality.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3 – 11, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belford *et al.* in view of Stone *et al.* More specifically, the Examiner stated that Belford *et al.* discloses:

- a) displaying a screen on the computer that includes a field for receiving expense report data;
- b) entering expense report data into the computer;
- c) displaying a screen on the computer that includes a field for receiving expense item data; and
- d) entering expense item data into the computer.

The Examiner also stated that Stone *et al.* discloses the purchasing of goods and services using a wireless laptop computer or a cell phone. Further, the Examiner stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the expense tracking and reporting system of Belford *et al.* with wireless technology as shown by Stone *et al.* because transmitting expense reports via a cell phone or other similar wireless network provides a mechanism for quickly, efficiently, and cost-effectively filing expense reports without relying on slower and/or less reliable methods.

The problem solved by Belford *et al.* is described as follows:

“There is no known consistent and reliable process for tracking legal expenses related to loan transactions. As a consequence, lenders find it difficult to determine if legal expenses are higher than they should have been or have been on past transactions. Without this information, lenders have difficulty in managing the costs associated with securing opinions and other work performed by law firms.” (Paragraph 4)

Belford *et al.*'s solution to the above problem is "a computer-based method for tracking and approving legal expenses." (Paragraph 21) The computer-based method connects computers to a server using "dial-in-connections, cable modems and high-speed lines." (Paragraph 23) Using those connections, outside legal counsel and internal legal counsel exchange legal expense information. (Paragraph 28)

In the "computer-based method for tracking and approving legal expenses" of Belford *et al.*, "dial-in-connections, cable modems and high-speed lines" are utilized to connect the counsel. (Paragraph 23) Belford *et al.*'s list of connections includes two specific connections, "dial-in-connections and cable modems," and a generic connection, "high-speed lines." Each of the specifically listed connections is a high-speed connection. Similarly, the generic connection is also a high-speed connection. Because Belford *et al.* only teaches using high-speed connections, Belford *et al.* teaches away from using a low-speed connection, such as a wireless connection, to interconnect computers to its server. As a result, one of skill in the art would not combine Belford *et al.*, which requires high-speed connections, with Stone *et al.*, which utilizes a wireless laptop computer or a cell phone to purchase goods and services.

Nonetheless, in order to expedite the prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 15 to require that travel expense report data be transmitted from a hand-held computer to a server via a wireless network. None of the cited references, individually or taken together, teach performing any operation on travel expense report data. More specifically, none of the cited references, taken individually or together, teach transmitting travel expense data from a hand-held computer to a server via a wireless network. Thus, amended independent claims 1 and 15, together with amended dependent claims 2 – 14, are allowable over the art of record.

The Examiner rejected claims 16 and 18 - 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belford *et al.*/Stone *et al.* and further in view of Bouet. More specifically, the Examiner stated that Belford *et al.* discloses:

- b) displaying a second screen on the computer, the second screen containing a field for receiving expense report data;
- c) displaying a third screen on the computer, the third screen containing a field for receiving expense item data.

The Examiner also stated that Belford *et al.* / Stone *et al.* discloses a wireless expense tracking and approval system that utilizes login and password control. Thus, according to the Examiner, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the expense tracking and reporting system of Belford *et al.* with user ID's and user assigned passwords as shown in Stone *et al.* The Examiner stated that Bouet discloses a download indicator and that, according to the Examiner, it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to combine the wireless expense tracking and reporting system of Belford *et al.* / Stone *et al.* with the data transfer status indicator of Bouet because such meters provide an indication of the time required to fully transfer a file.

As discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 15, one of skill in the art would not combine Belford *et al.* and Stone *et al.* because Belford *et al.* teaches away from using a low-speed connection, such as a wireless connection, to interconnect computers to its server.

The Applicant also believes that the Examiner's combination of Belford *et al.* / Stone *et al.* with Bouet is not proper. The Examiner states that the combination is proper because the combination would "provide an indication of the time required to fully transfer a file." However, the Applicant is not aware of any teaching in either Belford *et al.* or Stone *et al.* that indicates that a need to indicate the time required to transfer a file is needed. Recall that Belford *et al.* utilizes high-speed connections. Using such high-speed connections to transfer small files containing expense data takes a very short period of time. The value of such an indicator only arises when a low-speed connection, such as a wireless connection, is utilized. Because Belford *et al.* does not teach using low-speed connections, one of ordinary skill in the art would not provide a user with the status of a wireless data transfer. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is using impermissible hindsight to combine Bouet with Belford *et al.* / Stone *et al.*

Nonetheless, in order to expedite the prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended claim 16 to require displaying a screen on a hand-held computer that includes a field for receiving travel expense report data. None of the cited references individually or taken together, teach displaying such a screen. Thus, independent claim 16, together with dependent claims 17–20, are allowable over the art of record.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Hoyt A. Fleming III
Registration No. 41752

Date: June 7, 2004

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Address correspondence to: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer Number or Bar Code Label 28422 | or <input type="checkbox"/> Correspondence Address Below Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP P.O. Box 140678 Boise, ID 83714 | Direct telephone calls to: Hoyt A. Fleming III (208) 336-5237 |
|--|---|--|